

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-30 are pending in the application. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 5-30 have been identified as containing allowable subject matter. Claims 1-3 stand rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration of these claims in view of the following.

Claims 2, 3 and 5-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (2nd paragraph) as being indefinite. In particular, claim 2 has been identified as being “indefinite” for its use of the phrase “based on respective ones of the plurality of time interval control units.” Claim 9 has been identified as being “indefinite” as lacking an antecedent basis for the limitation “a delayed output signal.” Although Applicants believe that the claim language as originally presented in claims 2 and 9 is proper, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims 2 and 9 to overcome the deficiencies identified. Applicants respectfully request therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 5-15.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,137,336 (Baba et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because nothing in Baba et al. anticipates (or suggests) the unique signaling device as claimed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, claim 1 is now directed to a signaling device having a “signal generator generating a plurality of output signals at a plurality of respective time intervals” and “a plurality of time interval control units regulating the respective time intervals of the plurality of output signals.” In particular, the “plurality of time interval control units are a first plurality of delay cells used to delay respective ones of the plurality of output signals based on a plurality of individual control signals respectively received by the first plurality of delay cells,” as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Baba et al. anticipates (or renders obvious) the unique use of a plurality of delay cells used to delay respective ones of the

plurality of output signals based on a plurality of individual control signals, as claimed. Applicants conclusion is confirmed from the Office Action in which it is stated "the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a signaling device . . . as recited in claim 4; and specifically the limitation directed to the plurality of time interval control units or a second plurality of delay cells . . . used to delay respective ones of the plurality of output signals based on the plurality of individual control signals . . . respectively received by the second plurality of delay cells." Office Action dated May 19, 2003 (Paper No. 7) at 5.<sup>1</sup>

As confirmed in the Office Action, nothing in any of the prior art of record (including Baba et al.) discloses or suggests the use of a plurality of delay cells in the manner recited in claim 1. For at least this reason alone, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

As claims 2 and 3 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1, the rejection of claims 2 and 3 has similarly been overcome for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and earnestly solicit allowance of the application with claims 1-3 and 5-30.

Dated: August 7, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Eric Oliver

Registration No.: 35,307  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
(202) 785-9700  
Attorney for Applicants

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the limitation of claim 4 originally used the label "second" plurality of delay cells, whereas claim 1 has been amended to include the label "first" to denote the same plurality of delay cells.